

REMARKS

Status of the Application

Applicant thanks the Examiner for accepting the drawings filed on April 7, 2006. Applicant further thanks the Examiner for indicating his consideration of all the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statements filed on September 14, 2007, August 14, 2009, and July 30, 2009. Finally, Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating receipt of all certified copies of the priority documents.

Claims 1-10 are all the claims pending in the Application. Claims 1, 2 and 5-10 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claim 3 currently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Japanese Publication 2001-179847 to Ryo (hereinafter Ryo), in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,853,653 to Olbert et al. (hereinafter Olbert), and further view of either WO Publication 2002/078939 to Hirai et al. (as translated in U.S. Publication 2004/0013754, hereinafter Hirai) or U.S Patent No. 4,963,207 to Laurent (hereinafter Laurent).

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over the references as applied to claim 3 in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,182,731 to Urayama (hereinafter Urayama).

Per this amendment, new claims 11 and 12 have been added. Applicant submits that the new claims are fully supported throughout the Specification as filed, and no new matter has been added. For example, support for claims 11 and 12 can be found in paragraph [0022] of the Specification as filed. Applicant further submits that claims 11-12 patentably distinguish over the cited art.

Claim Rejections

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ryo in view of Olbert, in further view of either Hirai or Laurent. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

As currently amended, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

a bead core-holding device for holding the bead core;
a disk integrally rotating with the bead core-holding device to
wind and laminate said ribbon-shaped bead filler rubber on a disk
surface;

an extruder extruding said ribbon-shaped bead filler rubber in accordance with its winding;
a ribbon-attaching roller displaceably provided on the disk surface of the disk and pressing the extruded ribbon-shaped bead filler rubber against the disk; and
a bead removing device configured to project perpendicularly from the disk surface, and remove the preset bead from the disk.

Applicant respectfully submits that the alleged combination fails to disclose *at least* the above recited features, and would not have rendered such features obvious at the time of invention.

For example, claim 3 recites, “a bead removing device configured to project perpendicularly from the disk surface, and remove the preset bead from the disk.” Applicant submits that the combination of references fails to disclose *at least* this feature of claim 1. Specifically, the Ryo reference provides no disclosure of a bead removing device much less the one recited in claim 1. Furthermore, the width controller 4 in the Ryo reference would make such a bead removing device impractical. For example, it would not be obvious to incorporate a bead removing device as claimed into the Ryo device because the bead in Ryo is formed “in a predetermined width controller (4),” and the placement of the width controller 4 on the outside surface of tube support plate 3 may prevent any possible bead removing device from functioning correctly. (Ryo, ¶ [0019]).

Applicant further submits that neither Olbert, Hirai, or Laurent, taken individually or in combination, remedy the above described deficiency in Ryo. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited art.

With regard to claim 4, Applicant respectfully submits that Urayama also fails to remedy the above-described deficiency in Ryo. For example, Urayama fails to disclose “a bead removing device configured to project perpendicularly from the disk surface.” Instead, Urayama discloses using progressively stronger magnets to remove a bead from one device, and transfer it to the next. (See e.g., Urayama, col. 4, lines 20-24). Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 4 patentably distinguishes over the cited art due *at least* to its dependence on claim 3, as well as its additionally recited features.

Finally, Applicant submits that claims 11-12 patentably distinguish over the cited art due *at least* to their dependence on claim 3, as well as their additionally recited features.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. DeBoy/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Mark J. DeBoy
Registration No. 66,983

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 8, 2010